



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

| APPLICATION NO. | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. | CONFIRMATION NO. |
|---|-------------|---|----------------------|------------------|
| 09/988,899 | 11/19/2001 | Hendricus Renerus Jacobus Mattheus Hoogenboom | DX/003 CON | 9170 |
| 1473 | 7590 | 07/21/2005 | EXAMINER | |
| FISH & NEAVE IP GROUP ROPES & GRAY LLP 1251 AVENUE OF THE AMERICAS FL C3 NEW YORK, NY 10020-1105 | | | PONNALURI, PADMASHRI | |
| | | ART UNIT | PAPER NUMBER | |
| | | | 1639 | |

DATE MAILED: 07/21/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

| | | |
|---|--|---|
| Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief | Application No. 09/988,899 | Applicant(s) HOOGENBOOM, HENDRICUS RENERUS JACOBUS M |
| | Examiner Padmashri Ponnaluri | Art Unit 1639 |

--The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address--

THE REPLY FILED 22 June 2005 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE.

1. The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on the same day as filing a Notice of Appeal. To avoid abandonment of this application, applicant must timely file one of the following replies: (1) an amendment, affidavit, or other evidence, which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee) in compliance with 37 CFR 41.31; or (3) a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114. The reply must be filed within one of the following time periods:

- a) The period for reply expires _____ months from the mailing date of the final rejection.
 b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection.

Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f).

Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

NOTICE OF APPEAL

2. The Notice of Appeal was filed on 22 June 2005. A brief in compliance with 37 CFR 41.37 must be filed within two months of the date of filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal. Since a Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed within the time period set forth in 37 CFR 41.37(a).

AMENDMENTS

3. The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will not be entered because
 (a) They raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);
 (b) They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below);
 (c) They are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal; and/or
 (d) They present additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims.

NOTE: See Continuation Sheet. (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).

4. The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121. See attached Notice of Non-Compliant Amendment (PTOL-324).

5. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): _____.

6. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) _____ would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment canceling the non-allowable claim(s).

7. For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) will not be entered, or b) will be entered and an explanation of how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided below or appended.

The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:

Claim(s) allowed: none.

Claim(s) objected to: none.

Claim(s) rejected: 1-3 and 11-16.

Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: none.

AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE

8. The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but before or on the date of filing a Notice of Appeal will not be entered because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and sufficient reasons why the affidavit or other evidence is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).
9. The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing a Notice of Appeal, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will not be entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to overcome all rejections under appeal and/or appellant fails to provide a showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 41.33(d)(1).

10. The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation of the status of the claims after entry is below or attached.

REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER

11. The request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because:
See Continuation Sheet.

12. Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s). (PTO/SB/08 or PTO-1449) Paper No(s). _____.

13. Other: _____.


PADMASHRI PONNALURI
PRIMARY EXAMINER

Padmashri Ponnaluri
 Primary Examiner
 Art Unit: 1639



Continuation of 3. NOTE: Applicants proposed amendments to the claims were not entered for the following reasons: a) the proposed amendments were not presented earlier; b) the proposed amendment limitations require new search, i.e., the markush group of plurality of polypeptides was not present in the claims earlier, which may require a new search; and the scope of the claims is broadened, i.e., in claim 12 the number of clones has been deleted c) the proposed amendments may raise new matter rejections, i.e., the proposed Markush limitaitons of plurality of polypeptides may raise new matter rejection; and the proposed amendments raise new 112, second paragraph rejections (i.e., antecedent basis rejection); d) the proposed amendments do not place the application in better form for appeal.

Continuation of 11. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: Applicants arguments regarding the prior art rejections are based on the proposed amendments. Applicants argue that the references (EP 844306, and U S Patent 6,172,197 B1, US Patent 5,969,108) refer to only one approach in which, both chains are cloned into the same vector, and further argue that this approach does not result in 10 14 clones, and one polypeptide is fixed. Applicants argument are not persuasive because the limitaitons applicants referring to were not entered into the application, and require new search and consideration. Further the rejections of record have been maintained, since the instant claims are not drawn to methods, and the claims do not recite 10 14 clones.